IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No. 09/682,583 2

Group Art Unit: 3691

Filing Date: 09/21/2001 3

Examiner: Akintola, Olabode

4

Inventor: Brotherston, David

Commissioner for Patents

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Honorable Commissioner for Patents:

P.O. Box 1450

Attorney Docket No. P3S2002336US

5

1

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING PRODUCTS AND SERVICES IN A TRANSPORT VEHICLE USING A NETWORK OF **COMPUTERS**

6

7

8

9

10

USA

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

August 28, 2009

Gifu-city, Japan

REQUEST FOR STATUS

It has been more than two months since a Reply Brief was filed in the aboveidentified application. In particular, the Patent Application Information Retrieval system ("PAIR") indicates that the Reply Brief was received in the US Patent and Trademark Office on June 18, 2009, and forwarded to the Examiner on June 26, 2008. The eight day gap between the date the Reply Brief was received and forwarded to the Examiner was presumably due to review by US Patent Office personnel to ensure that the Reply Brief was in compliance with 37 CFR 41.41.

According to 37 CFR 41.43(a)(1), "[a]fter receipt of a reply brief in compliance with § 41.41, the primary examiner must acknowledge receipt and entry of the reply brief." If the reply brief is not in compliance with 37 CFR 41.41, MPEP 1208 states that "the examiner must notify appellant that the reply brief has not been considered and the reason for noncompliance." MPEP 1209 recommends that the Examiner use form paragraph 12.182 on Form PTOL-90 to notify the appellant.

As of yet no notification has been received from the Examiner of whether the Reply Brief has been entered and considered. Since two months is the period that MPEP 1207.02 states is the time in which the Examiner should furnish the appellant with a written statement in answer to the appellant's brief, two months should be more than adequate for the Examiner to have reviewed the Reply Brief and provide an acknowledgement of receipt thereof.

Please also note that as of September 21, 2009, this application will have been pending in the US Patent and Trademark Office for eight years. Section 707.02 of the MPEP provides that (emphasis in original):

Any application that has been pending five years should be carefully studied by the supervisory patent examiner and every effort >should be< made to terminate its prosecution. In order to accomplish this result, the application is to be considered "special" by the examiner.

In addition, the new USPTO Director, David Kappos, has stressed the need to reduce pendency and engage in compact prosecution.

Accordingly, a request for a status report of the application is hereby solicited, and in particular, an indication of when an acknowledgement of receipt of the Reply Brief may be expected. Pursuant to Paragraph (D) of Section 203.08 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, please send a written status report by facsimile or mail to the correspondence address of record . . . thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian P. Furrer, USPTO Reg. No. 37,627